

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-36 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 15, 22, 23, 27, and 34 being the independent claims. Claims 1 and 34 are currently amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Examiner Interview

Applicants acknowledge with gratitude the interview granted by the Examiner on December 19, 2006. At issue was whether McCormack works after replacing diodes 72 and 74 with native FETs and whether, even with replacing, diode 72 or McCormack perform the recited conditions in claim 1.

Allowed Claims

Applicants acknowledge with gratitude the Examiner's allowance of claims 15-33.

Allowable Claims

In section 3 of the Office Action, claims 4-10 and 13 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In light of the remarks below with regard to amended

Atty. Dkt. No. 1875.1270001

independent claim 1, from which claims 4-10 and 13 depend, Applicants assert that amended independent claim 1 is patentable, and thus respectfully request that the objection to claims 4-10 and 13 be withdrawn and that these claims be passed to allowance.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 11, 12, 14, and 34-36

In section 1 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 11, 12, 14, and 34-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,535,983 to McCormack *et al.* (hereinafter "McCormack") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,886,925 to Campardo *et al.* (hereinafter "Campardo"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, among other features, *wherein said relay is closed when no power is applied to said relay and wherein said relay is open-circuited when power is applied to said relay.*

In McCormack, a detection phase is used to determine whether an end device is a system powered device or a standard device. McCormack, abstract. Based on the arrangement of the diode 72 and the polarity of the applied voltage during the detection phase, the load 33 is removed from the current path. McCormack, Col. 9, lines 30-36 and FIGS. 4 and 5A. The end device has a current draw profile which is distinctive. However, nothing in McCormack even suggests that the diode 72, upon which the Office Action relies, is closed when no power is applied to the diode 72 and open-circuited when power is applied to the diode 72. More specifically, McCormack does not teach or

suggest wherein said relay is closed when no power is applied to said relay and wherein said relay is open-circuited when power is applied to said relay, as set forth in Applicants' claim 1, as amended.

The Office Action relies on native NMOS device 48 of Campardo to allegedly show that implementing the diode 72 of McCormack in the manner taught by Campardo would cause the diode 72 of McCormack to be closed when no power was applied to the diode 72. However, Applicants assert that implementing the diode 72 of McCormack in the manner taught by Campardo does not cause the diode 72 to be open-circuited when power is applied to the diode 72. To the contrary, applying power to the diode 72 in McCormack, even if the diode 72 were a native NMOS device as described in Campardo, would cause the diode 72 to be closed. Accordingly, Applicants assert that Campardo does not remedy the deficiencies of McCormack.

Moreover, it is obvious from Figure 2 of McCormack that current is intended to flow in only one direction through diodes 72 and 74. Applicants do not believe that replacing the diodes 72 and 74 in Figure 2 of McCormack with the native NMOS device 48 of Campardo is appropriate because doing so would eliminate the unidirectional current flow characteristics of the diodes 72 and 74, rendering the system shown in Figure 2 of McCormack insufficient for its intended purpose.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants assert that independent claim 1, as amended, is patentable over McCormack and Campardo, alone or in any combination.

Furthermore, independent claim 34, as amended, is also patentable over McCormack and Campardo, alone or in any combination, for reasons similar to those set

forth above with respect to independent claim 1, as amended, and further in view of its own features.

Moreover, claims 2, 3, 11, 12, and 14, which depend from independent claim 1, and claims 35 and 36, which depend from independent claim 34, are also patentable over McCormack and Campardo, alone or in any combination, for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to their independent claims, and further in view of their own respective features.

Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3, 11, 12, 14, and 34-36 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Bryan S. Wade
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 58,228

Date: 1/12/07

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

608199v1